

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of:

Kil-soo JUNG et al.

Application No. 10/796,284

Group Art Unit: 2159

Confirmation No. 9369

Filed: March 10, 2004

Examiner: Miranda Le

For: METHOD OF REPRODUCING AN INFORMATION STORAGE MEDIUM HAVING DATA
STRUCTURE FOR BEING REPRODUCED ADAPTIVELY ACCORDING TO PLAYER
STARTUP INFORMATION

APPLICANTS' STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

Mail Stop Issue Fee
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is in response to the Notice of Allowance and the Notice of Allowability of June 26, 2009. The issue fee and the publication fee have not yet been paid.

The Notice of Allowability includes an Examiner's Amendment and an Interview Summary for an interview between the Examiner, Miranda Le, and the undersigned attorney, Randall S. Svihla. The Examiner states as follows in the Interview Summary:

Claims discussed: 1, 3-15, 18-21, and 26-28

Identification of prior art discussed: [none listed]

Agreement with respect to the claims was reached.

Substance of Interview: Applicant agreed to amend claims 1, 4-7, 13-15, 18, 21, 22 as detailed in the attached examiner's amendment to further clarify the claim [sic] invention of the current application and put these claims in better condition for allowance.

The Interview Summary indicates that the interview was a telephone interview that was conducted on May 29, 2009. However, the attorney's records do not indicate that a telephone interview was conducted on May 29, 2009.

The Examiner and the attorney discussed the Office Action of January 5, 2009, and the Amendment of April 6, 2009, during a telephone discussion on April 23, 2009, during which the Examiner stated that she would allow the application if the applicants would agree to amend claims 1, 4-7, 13-15, 18, 21, and 22 as shown in the Examiner's Amendment, and to cancel claims 3, 8-12, 20, and 23. The attorney stated that he would forward the Examiner's proposal to the applicants for their review.

On May 13, 2009, the attorney sent the Examiner an e-mail authorizing the Examiner to amend claims 1, 4-7, 13-15, 18, 21, and 22 as shown in the Examiner's Amendment, and to cancel claims 3, 8-12, 20, and 23. That same day the attorney left a voice mail message for the Examiner stating that the attorney had sent the e-mail to the Examiner authorizing the Examiner's Amendment. That same day the Examiner sent the attorney an e-mail stating that she would do the Examiner's Amendment as soon as she could.

On June 4, 2009, the attorney left a voice mail message for the Examiner asking about the status of the Examiner's Amendment. That same day the Examiner called the attorney back and stated that she would be issuing a Notice of Allowance with the Examiner's Amendment in the near future.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN, LLP

Date: 07/09/09

By: 

Randall S. Svihla
Registration No. 56,273

1400 Eye St., N.W.
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510